



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Pat nt and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

UF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/204,479	12/03/98	TREMBLAY	M SP-3289US

LM02/0720
SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON FRANKLIN &
FRIEL
25 METRO DRIVE STE 700
SAN JOSE CA 95110-1349

EXAMINER

ENG, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2783

DATE MAILED:

5
07/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/204,479

Applicant(s)

Tremblay et al.

Examiner

David Y. Eng

Group Art Unit

2783



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2 and 4

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit:

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

① With respect to the last two lines of claim 1, it is not seen how that is related to the register file and the function unit which are for deriving specifiers. The recitation in claims 5-16 have similar defect. Neither the function unit or the register files are recited for deriving specifiers or for accessing data using specifiers of specific format.

② Function of the decoder is not clear. See claims 2, 17-18 for example. It is not seen how a decoder which is for decoding instructions to generate control signals is able to derive implicit register from explicit register specifier.

③ With respect to claim 19, function of the register file is not clear. It is not seen how a register file which is commonly having a plurality of registers for storing data is able to generate two pointers as recited. Further, claim 19 fails to recite how the function unit and the register file of parent claim uses the pointers so that meaningful operation can be achieved.

④ With respect to all the claims including method claims 20-22, it is not clear what is meant by "explicitly define" and "implicitly derive" are.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit:

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck (6,067,159) in view of De Ward (4,155,119).

Fleck discloses a processor having a register file 300, a decoder and an execution unit (11a and 11b). Fleck does not state how addresses of the register file (a memory) are formulated. However, De Ward teaches in Figure 7 that an address (218) (read on explicit address) of a memory can be generated by concatenating a page number (from table 215) to a displacement (210). The next address (read on implicit address derived from the explicit address) can be derived from the previous address by merely incrementing the displacement with an offset value. If the memory management of DeWard is implemented in the register file of the Fleck system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate register address as taught by DeWard so that the register file in Fleck can be accessed.

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 09/204,585 in view of Deward.

The claims of 09/204,585 recites a plurality of functional units and a register. The claims do not state how addresses of the register file (a memory) are formulated. However, De Ward teaches in Figure 7 that an address (218) (read on explicit address) of a memory can be generated by concatenating a page number (from table 215) to a displacement (210). The next address (read on implicit address derived from the explicit address) can be derived from the previous address by

Art Unit:

merely incrementing the displacement with an offset value. If the memory management of DeWard is implemented in the register file of 09/204,585, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate register address as taught by DeWard so that the register file can be accessed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Eng', with a stylized flourish at the end.

DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER